

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC § 112. The claims have been amended and are believed to fully comply with section 112.

The Examiner also rejected the claims under 35 USC § 103(a). With regard to that rejection, Application must articulate several points.

KENNEDY(5,233,283). Kennedy pulses input to the battery of his curing light. Kennedy does **NOT** pulse input to an LED chip in a curing light. Kennedy's pulsing of electrical input to the battery has to do with charging the battery. But the output from the battery to the LED in Kennedy is constant current, not pulsed. *Applicant has claimed pulsed current input to an LED chip in a curing light, and this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Kennedy.* Applicant requests withdrawal of Kennedy as a reference.

OSTLER (6,282,013). Ostler discloses pulsed light output from a curing light. Ostler does **NOT** pulse input to an LED chip in a curing light. The curing light discussed in Ostler is an Argon gas laser. If pulsed current input is provided to an Argon gas laser, it will not lase. The method used to obtain pulsed light output from an Argon gas laser is to use a rapidly opening & closing shutter or fluttering mirror between the gas laser tube and the fiber which is to pick up the laser light. Such an arrangement provides pulsed light output. *However, nowhere in Ostler is there any suggestion of pulsed current input to an LED in order to achieve a continuous wave light output as Applicant has claimed.* Applicant requests withdrawal of Ostler as a reference.

KOVAC (WO 99.35995) Kovac is believed to be relevant only in that it discloses an LED curing light. However, Kovac does not disclose important elements found in Applicant's claims, such as (i) pulsed electrical input to an LED, (ii) continuous wave light output from the LED as a result of such pulsed electrical input to the LED, (iii) avoidance of heat buildup in the curing light as a result of such pulsed current input to the LED, and (iv) light output directly in front of the LED being output at an angle of from about 30 degrees to about 150 degrees with respect to a longitudinal axis of a heat sink to which the LED is attached (Kovac uses a light guide to angle the light instead of angling

mounting of the LED on a heat sink). Therefore Applicant believes the claims are patentable over Kovac.

Further, none of the references cited by the Examiner recites "*wherein said light output directly in front of said LED is output at an angle of from about 30 degrees to about 150 degrees with respect to a longitudinal axis of said heat sink*" which Applicant has claimed. Applicant believes this limitation is being improperly ignored and adds patentable weight to the claims.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the patent application.

Any fees should be charged to deposit account no. 50-0081.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of June, 2005.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel P. McCarthy', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Daniel P. McCarthy
Reg. No. 36,600
PARSONS, BEHLE & LATIMER
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 532-1234